

Date: Wed, 9 Feb 94 22:28:28 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #129
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Wed, 9 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 129

Today's Topics:

 A code speed question
 Anyone Hear from Space Shuttle?
 exit
 FCC.GOV on-line
 Illegal Activities of Dominique Cormann
 Law changing?
 QSLing via F6FNU
 Ramsey FX Transceivers
 RCLUS...

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 7 Feb 1994 09:50:53 GMT
From: pacbell.com!sgiblab!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!xlink.net!
scsing.switch.ch!swidir.switch.ch!univ-lyon1.fr!elendir@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: A code speed question
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Bob,

Bob Engberg (engberg@edfue0.ctis.af.mil) wrote:

: When I studied for my Extra and Commercial licenses. I used a PC with
: random code groups. I pushed it to a speed that I couldn't copy 100%.
: I also listened to W1AW. There is no way I can write down 30/35 wpm but
: I discovered I could "see it in my mind's eye" . Just a little at first,

: then more as I continued to practice. After listening and copying about
: 75% at the high speeds, 20 wpm seemed slow. One other trick: I recorded
: W1AW on tape and played it back. Of course, after a few playbacks, you
[...]

Ok for copying at high speeds. But what is W1AW ? Unfortunately, first I'm
in France, and second I have yet no decametric transceiver ! So, I guess I'll
try with my computer programs at very fast speeds, but first, I would say
I must finish to learn all letters and signs at 14 wpm !

Thanks to everybody that replied !

And 73 from Paris !

Vince.

Date: 08 Feb 1994 18:55:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!math.ohio-state.edu!usc!news.bbn.com!news!
levin@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Anyone Hear from Space Shuttle?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CKvE1n.3IEI@austin.ibm.com> blood@austin.ibm.com () writes:

Has anyone heard the shuttle on 2mtrs? With 3 hams out there and
a broken satellite, perhaps they have some time on their hands.
Or just too busy trying to fix it. Where Do I listen? 145.55?

I've heard them transmitting packet Saturday and Sunday (I'm pretty
sure it was them -- I don't copy 1200 wpm in my head that well -- but
they came in and faded out at the right times). I didn't hear anything
yesterday or this morning, though.

Listen on 145.55. Do NOT transmit on that frequency. If you hear
them on voice, call on one of

144.91 144.97

144.93 144.99

144.95

but you'll have to guess which one. If you hear them on packet, call
W5RRR-1 on 144.49. Again, do NOT transmit on .55.

(On the other hand, Russian space station MIR is still up and the hams
on board do use 145.55 for both voice and packet, and they operate
simplex. Confusing, isn't it?)

Hope this helped

/JBL KD10N

=

Nets: levin@bbn.com |
pots: (617)873-3463 |
ARS: KD10N |

"I gotta go."
-- I. Shoales

Date: Tue, 8 Feb 1994 18:19:07 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!ukma!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!dgg.cr.usgs.gov!
bodoh@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: exit
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Feb6.004704.10186@nicad3.nic.bc.ca>, mcphail@nicad3.nic.bc.ca
writes:

|> help... I think I'm in but ??? Bob, VE7ZP
 ^^^

Bobbit?

Date: 9 Feb 94 05:57:01 GMT
From: psinntp!psinntp!pixar!bruce@rutgers.rutgers.edu
Subject: FCC.GOV on-line
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

[I think it bounced the first time I posted this message. Sorry if it repeats.]

I was able to get e-mail through to the system manager at FCC.GOV today.
FCC now has their own system on the Internet. Expect them to be listening,
too :-)

Since it takes a lot of work to configure a new system on the net,
I suggest we not flood their system manager with mail, but wait a month
or two until he announces what services are available.

Bruce Perens

--

--

Bruce Perens AB6YM Bruce@Pixar.com 510-215-3502

Date: 8 Feb 1994 13:11:17 -0500

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9402091755.AA12482@opus.xyplex.com> sasminkey@xap.xyplex.com writes:

>
>F6FNU has been dumped on by many hams regarding his QSL practices, but if
>you follow his rules, he is 100 percent reliable and quick, too. Don't waste
>your time using the bureau with F6FNU, and don't waste your time complaining
>about his rules if you want a card from him! :-) If it's been more than
>six months and you want a card, try anyway. Others have gotten cards from
>him beyond the six month period. The SAE/US\$2/no IRC/no buro is hard and
>fast with him, though.
>
>73,
>Scott W01G

Nope...I've had 100% return from F6FNU also, but have never enclosed more than US\$1 per card. He's always returned the cards using reduced-rate airmail (note the cut corners on the envelope) which costs him well under \$1.00 (\$0.40 or so the last time I looked at the exchange rate). So he's still making a very tidy profit at \$1.00 per card.

Rich Eckman K04MR
NASA Langley
eckman@eos1.larc.nasa.gov

Date: 10 Feb 1994 01:01:51 GMT
From: autodesk.com!daved@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Ramsey FX Transceivers
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

>
> (lots deleted)
>
> call John Lansdale and ask for his price sheet. He sells VHF Lo-band (for 6m)
> Micors, complete with control group, for \$75+shipping.
>
>

Are these retunable for 2m? with the right split, or modifiable to be so?
(as easily as you described)

With a service manual, I wouldn't be afraid to retune an old commercial rig, the trick (secret?) seems to be in knowing *exactly* what old rigs will retune without (much) part swapping. Any (further) pointers on sources and models to look for would be greatly appreciated!

Note - I've built a FX-146, and use it for packet only. It picks up lots of stuff it shouldn't (I have yet to call and ask for the filter that'll fix this). I expect it puts out the illegal harmonics that have been repeatedly mentioned here. If anyone has or knows of a fix for the transmitter, I'd love to implement it. I also wouldn't mind at all were I to have a chance to put it on an analyzer and see just how bad it really is... (Hey Al - Naw, I bet you're too busy....;-)

Dave Duchesneau KD6LSA

Date: 9 Feb 94 15:49:45 GMT
From: psinntp!psinntp!relay1!ecdcsvr!klf@rutgers.rutgers.edu
Subject: RCLUS...
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Anyone know where I can FTP a program called RCLUS? It is a program which lets you receive PacketCluster stuff without being connected. It is written by an Hb9 I believe. I know its out there but I don't hv Archie or Gopher to look. Thanks.

DE KA3PLS... Ken...

Date: Wed, 9 Feb 1994 00:10:53 GMT
From: world!barnaby@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2j6hr2\$gl8@cascade.ens.tek.com>, <CKwpB9.C1p@world.std.com>, <1994Feb8.155316.10036@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: 40 meter QRP (cw or ssb)

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>He says that if you try to copy plaintext behind with a typewriter,
>it's much harder than copying in real time because the actions of
>auditory recognition, conscious evaluation, and mechanical reproduction
>are divorced from each other enough by that intermediate step to cause
>you to make errors if your mind wanders, in the slightest, to thinking
>about what's being sent. He says you should train yourself to *not*
>try to interpret what's being sent as you copy if you want maximum
>speed and accuracy of copy. Try thinking about *anything* but the
>code you're hearing while you practice copying. Let the conditioned
>reflex do the work.

>That's *not* the way most hams do Morse. Most try to force the

>decoding into resembling spoken language, (which it's not, who
>speaks by spelling out each word?) and attempt to copy in their
>heads. At best they write down what they *think* they understood
>of the decoded message rather than just accurately copying the
>characters as received without trying to understand the message
>until it's down on paper. Naturally that impairs the speed and
>accuracy of their copy, but since accurate copy isn't really
>their goal, that's a moot point except for message handling and
>taking tests where accuracy of copy is the critical issue.

Well, Gary, you've verbalized nicely what I've sort-of-felt.

My question then is "Where to go from here?"

I can't write fast enough to go faster than say 25 WPM, I can't hear words yet (a few only). I'd like to break the barrier and be able to (as some buddies do) lean back in the chair and comfortably copy 35+ without writing or tying a thing.

Sounds like I should forget the typewriter, as it appears only good for code groups, not QSOs.

Any advice for cracking the morse-as-characters to morse-as-words barrier?

Richard Barnaby

AA1IB Worcester, Vermont

A

A

TIA

Date: Tue, 8 Feb 1994 23:31:08 GMT

From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!emory!wa4mei.ping.com!ke4zv!

gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <CKwpB9.C1p@world.std.com>, <1994Feb8.155316.10036@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2j8m33\$apn@news.acns.nwu.edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: 40 meter QRP (cw or ssb)

In article <2j8m33\$apn@news.acns.nwu.edu> rdewan@casbah.acns.nwu.edu (Rajiv Dewan) writes:

>In article <1994Feb8.155316.10036@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,

>Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:

[deleted description of an intercept operator's methods]

>>That's *not* the way most hams do Morse. Most try to force the
>>decoding into resembling spoken language, (which it's not, who
>>speaks by spelling out each word?) and attempt to copy in their
>>heads. At best they write down what they *think* they understood
>>of the decoded message rather than just accurately copying the

>>characters as received without trying to understand the message
>>until it's down on paper. Naturally that impairs the speed and
>>accuracy of their copy, but since accurate copy isn't really
>>their goal, that's a moot point except for message handling and
>>taking tests where accuracy of copy is the critical issue.
>
><snip>
>
>I think that you have this backwards Gary. All hams use plaintext
>(by law) and you can copy at higher speeds if you can use your
>vocabulary information to speed up. In all QRQ tests that I have heard/read
>about, the limit for random group copy is always lower than that
>for *correct* plain text copy.

Copying plaintext by filling in holes from context obviously works for some people with some words/phrases, especially the highly stylized typical ham contact, however, try copying unfamiliar words that way, or a word you *think* is misspelled. If you are copying *correctly*, you'll copy the word as sent, not as you would spell it. But as I noted, that's not really important if you're just trying to follow the flow of a conversation rather than striving for perfect copy.

Max says he could copy 60 WPM for an entire watch without his error rate increasing. Many of the circuits he was intercepting were apparently paper tape driven. I don't think you can do that trying to consciously understand words as sent. Your mind would wander for a moment even under the best of conditions. Only an automatic reflex can keep up that kind of pace for hours on end.

He says the worst thing about copying on a typewriter is when a right hand character comes in while you're returning the carriage. He used a manual typewriter in the Navy of course. He says that with a computer, he uses an old VIC-20 now, wordwrap has increased his speed noticeably over his old best because he doesn't have to carry a character in his head while the carriage returns. Though he said it took him several months to break himself of swatting for the non-existent return lever every 60 characters.

It's remarkable to me that someone 70 years old can beat his own records set as a 20 year old. I wonder what he could have done if he'd had a computer then. Note I consider Max something of a prodigy, like a classical guitarist, or other musician. He has a "gift" as well as having spent, by now, many tens of thousands of hours of practicing. He said about 10% of the recruits in his class washed out at less than 20 WPM, about 60% were gone at 40 WPM, and only a very few ever got to 60 WPM despite having worked at it for 12 hours a day for the 6 weeks of their training. Obviously Max was in that elite group. I know I'd be in that initial 10%. My personal best has been 18 WPM after several hundred hours of practice. OTOH, I don't have the incentive of being stationed where I'm unlikely to be shot

at if my speed were higher. And I know there are better ways of communicating without all that drill. That's got to have some effect. Still, I don't have the "gift" and will be at best only a hacker for the rest of my life no matter how much I practice. I can't play a guitar worth a damn either, even though I worked my fingers bloody practicing. At best I can mechanically reproduce the notes. I just don't have the "ear" for the music. Max has the "ear" for code. That has nothing much to do with his actual hearing ability, he's nearly deaf now. It has to do with a certain wiring of the brain centers I think.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 8 Feb 1994 18:36:19 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!csn!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!

math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!rdewan@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2j6hr2\$gl8@cascade.ens.tek.com>, <CKwpB9.C1p@world.std.com>, <1994Feb8.155316.10036@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>h.acns.

Subject : Re: 40 meter QRP (cw or ssb)

In article <1994Feb8.155316.10036@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,

Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:

>I also have a friend who was a Navy radio intercept operator in WWII.
>There's no such thing as copying behind in this sort of work. It's all
>five letter groups of encrypted text. He was trained to associate a
>letter sound directly with a finger action on the keyboard, a form
>of Pavlovian conditioning. His conscious mind isn't involved at all.
>He can carry on a conversation with you while copying. When the code
>stops, he has to roll up the paper and read what he typed to see what
>the other operator sent. He's a remarkable code copying machine.
>

>He says that if you try to copy plaintext behind with a typewriter,
>it's much harder than copying in real time because the actions of
>auditory recognition, conscious evaluation, and mechanical reproduction
>are divorced from each other enough by that intermediate step to cause
>you to make errors if your mind wanders, in the slightest, to thinking
>about what's being sent. He says you should train yourself to *not*
>try to interpret what's being sent as you copy if you want maximum
>speed and accuracy of copy. Try thinking about *anything* but the

>code you're hearing while you practice copying. Let the conditioned
>reflex do the work.

I have heard this first-hand from a signal corpsman.

>That's **not** the way most hams do Morse. Most try to force the
>decoding into resembling spoken language, (which it's not, who
>speaks by spelling out each word?) and attempt to copy in their
>heads. At best they write down what they **think** they understood
>of the decoded message rather than just accurately copying the
>characters as received without trying to understand the message
>until it's down on paper. Naturally that impairs the speed and
>accuracy of their copy, but since accurate copy isn't really
>their goal, that's a moot point except for message handling and
>taking tests where accuracy of copy is the critical issue.

<snip>

I think that you have this backwards Gary. All hams use plaintext
(by law) and you can copy at higher speeds if you can use your
vocabulary information to speed up. In all QRQ tests that I have heard/read
about, the limit for random group copy is always lower than that
for **correct** plain text copy.

>

>I wish I'd known this when I was learning Morse. I kept futilely
>trying to make sense of what I was hearing, and got nowhere. I

Now this is a difficult task at best of times. :)

>finally hit on a shorthand method of writing down the Code that
>works for me, and which I can sight read nearly as well as ordinary
>text, but I wish I'd conditioned myself to type the text instead
>since it would be much faster.

```
Rajiv                               dit 1  dit
aa9ch                               1
r-dewan@nwu.edu ***** =
                * rajiv aa9ch/m * =
                * r-dewan @nwu.edu * 1
                * j45 str key on knee * 1
                ***** kwd ts50 tx bugcatcher * 1
                *                               *1
                * ***                               *** *H
                * * *                               * * *H
                base* *kenwd850*vert*80mloop* *kent**
                ***                               ***
```

Date: Mon, 7 Feb 1994 07:50:56 -0500

From: library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!
cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!news.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!news.ysu.edu!
psuvm!cunyvml!@nntp.ucsb.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <01H8EZGJ1SCIDU7RYC@tntech.edu>, <gregCKnJIF.LGx@netcom.com>,
<1994Feb4.163943.1@ntuvax.ntu.ac.sg>
Subject : Re: 40 meter QRP (cw or ssb)

In article <1994Feb4.163943.1@ntuvax.ntu.ac.sg>, asirene@ntuvax.ntu.ac.sg
wrote, in part:

> BTW, how do some of the people key
> so darned fast CW? Its like 30-40 wpm on my computer. Can they really decode
> this by ear or do they use computers for decoding too?
>

Yeah, if you hang in long enough with the practice, you can copy 40 wpm.
That's the ragged edge of my current capability, and I can't get it down on
paper that fast, but when you listen to it for a while, 35 wpm seems
leisurely.

--

73 de John Taylor W3ZID
rohvm1.mah48d@rohmmaas.com

Date: Mon, 7 Feb 1994 07:44:44 -0500

From: nntp.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.ans.net!
malgudi.oar.net!news.ysu.edu!psuvm!cunyvml!rohvm1!rohvm1.mah48d@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <gtaylor.315.0@taex003n.tamu.edu>, <20@w2xo.pgh.pa.us>,
<2ip6he\$933@cascade.ens.tek.com>psuvm
Subject : Re: Help - your Vertical Ant. experiences.

In article <1994Feb4.031616.1345@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
(Gary Coffman) wrote:

> In article <2ip6he\$933@cascade.ens.tek.com> t1terryb@cascade.ens.tek.com (Terry
Burge) writes:
> >Just for the record, I will state it again. A ground plane antenna has higher
> >gain than a vertical dipole. A quarter wave ground plane has a gain of some-

> >where around 6 db over isotropic where a dipole has a gain of 2.14 db over
> >isotropic at it's theoritical best.

> Repeating false statements makes them no less false. A 1/4 wave vertical
> over a *perfect* groundplane has *exactly* the same gain and pattern as
> a 1/2 wave vertical. But alas, there are no perfect groundplanes in the
> real world, so all real 1/4 wave verticals have less gain than 1/2 wave
> verticals because of losses in the imperfect current mirror.

Thanks, Gary. When I read the original posting, I immediately thought of
ol' Kurt N. Sterba, the nom de plume of the chap who writes the "Aerials"
column in WorldRadio, and who delights in debunking antenna mythology.
One wonders where on earth some of these notions arise.

--

73 de John Taylor W3ZID
rohvm1.mah48d@rohmmaas.com

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #129

